



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,399	09/30/2003	Chih-Hsiang Shen	TAIW 173	3751

7590 05/02/2006

RABIN & CHAMPAGNE, P.C.
Suite 500
1101 14 Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SABOURI, MAZDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/673,399	SHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mazda Sabouri	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2,8 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0203366 (Chen).
3. As to claim 1, Chen teaches a method for establishing Bluetooth communication between a two Bluetooth devices. Chen teaches that each of the Bluetooth devices has a Bluetooth module, Bluetooth address memory and a CPU. Chen teaches that the Bluetooth devices conjoin with outside devices such as computers, keyboards and mice. Chen teaches the two Bluetooth devices connecting via a cable and interchanging Bluetooth addresses with one another (control program means). Chen teaches the Bluetooth addresses being stored in memory (see Chen, paragraphs 12 and 13, and figures 1 and 2). Note that examiner interprets the combination of the Bluetooth devices and the outside devices (computer, keyboard or mouse) as being single entities. Further note that Chen does not explicitly teach any user operation after the Bluetooth devices have been connected. This reads on automatic transmission of

Bluetooth addresses (control program means) between the devices after the cable link has been established.

4. As to claim 2, note that in the rejection of claim 1, the Bluetooth devices (providing Bluetooth capability) can conjoin to a keyboard or mouse. The inherent function of a keyboard or mouse meets the limitations of this claim.

5. As to claim 8, Chen teaches a Bluetooth device (Bluetooth device conjoined to a mouse or keyboard) having wire interface (RS232) for connecting to a host system (another Bluetooth device conjoined to a computer). Chen teaches a Bluetooth interface for connecting to the host system wirelessly. Chen teaches control unit means for actuating the exchange of data for the purpose of establishing wireless communication with the host system. Chen teaches memory for storing information (addresses) sent by the control unit (see Chen, paragraphs 12 and 13, and figures 1 and 2). A power supply is inherent to the device, as it requires electricity to operate.

6. As to claim 9, Chen teaches that the transmission of Bluetooth data (addresses) is actuated when the Bluetooth device is connected, via a cable, to the host system (see Chen, paragraphs 12 and 13, and figures 1 and 2). Note that Chen does not teach a user actuating the transmission. This reads on automatic actuation from signals supplied through the cable.

7. Claims 6 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2005/0059346 (Gupta et al.).

8. As to claim 6, Gupta teaches a host computer that connects via a cable (USB) to a Bluetooth device. Gupta teaches that the host computer has software and processing

Art Unit: 2617

means (Bluetooth control program) to control the connected Bluetooth device. Gupta teaches that the Bluetooth device (which is controlled by the host computer) acts as a master (host) to other Bluetooth devices (see Gupta, paragraphs 28-29 and figure 2).

9. As to claim 7, note that in the rejection of claim 6, the cable is a USB cable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0203366 (Chen). What is lacking is the use of a USB cable for the wired link. Chen teaches using an RS232 cable. USB cables are well known in the arts. USB cables are universally known, and provide cost efficient means for connecting computers to peripheral devices. Chen teaches that the Bluetooth devices may operate in conjunction (providing Bluetooth capability) with computers and there peripheral devices (keyboard, mouse) (see Chen, paragraph 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time the invention was made to use a USB cable in place of the RS232 cable cited by Chen, for the reasons mentioned above.

12. Claims 4 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0203366 (Chen) in view of US 2003/0100263 (Tanaka et al.).

13. As to claim 4, note the use of USB cables cited in the rejection of claim 3. What is lacking is the use of the cable to power up a wireless peripheral device. Tanaka

teaches using a wired connection on a peripheral device (having wireless capabilities) so that the peripheral device can recharge its battery (see Tanaka, paragraphs 6-8). Note that USB cables inherently have the means to provide power, as defined by official USB standards. The motivation for using Tanaka can be found in Tanaka. Tanaka teaches that power loss is a big problem for wireless peripheral devices (see Tanaka, paragraph 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts to combine the teachings of Tanaka into those of Chen, for the reasons mentioned above.

14. As to claim 5, Tanaka further teaches that the computer and its peripheral device can switch between a wired and wireless connection (see Tanaka, paragraphs 6-8). This teaching is related to the teachings of Tanaka cited in the rejection of claim 4. The wireless peripheral device and the computer must have means for switching to and from a wired connection, so that the recharging of the peripheral device can occur.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 2003/0050009 (Kurisko et al.) teaches a security apparatus and method during Bluetooth pairing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mazda Sabouri whose telephone number is 571-272-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on 561-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DUC NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mazda Sabouri
Examiner
Art Unit 2617